

8-28-1888

Letter: Lafayette McLaws to Isaac R. Pennypacker, August 28, 1888

Lafayette McLaws

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wofford.edu/littlejohnmclaws>

 Part of the [Military History Commons](#), [Political History Commons](#), [Social History Commons](#),
and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McLaws, Lafayette, "Letter: Lafayette McLaws to Isaac R. Pennypacker, August 28, 1888" (1888). *The Lafayette McLaws Papers*. Book 8.
<http://digitalcommons.wofford.edu/littlejohnmclaws/8>

Savannah Georgia

August. 28. 1888.

J A Pennington
Pittsburgh Pa

Dear Sir

I herewith send you a Photo
of myself taken some eight or ten years
ago. This is in compliance with your
request in your letter of the 25th rec'd.
Yesterday, it has become indistinct
by age and the effects of this moist
climate. but if it will answer your
purpose. I will be gratified as I feel
complimented by the desire expressed
for it.

As far as I understand this Corps was composed
of three Divisions Commanded respectively by
Gen^l L. M. Hood & Pickett - and also, I believe,
by Gen^l E. P. Alexander. He knew these his Division
Commanders, in his capacity as regimental com-

instructions that he could give, and therefore
never gave any, beyond the orders of March
and Concessions, until matters of detail. He
never had Conference with his Division Commanders,
who in turn never sought him, except to get "the
news" - never for advice, for they, were
fully ^{in ability} his equals - nor did he ask Council
no conference with his equals in rank, nor
even with his Subordinates. He allowed himself
to be influenced by very inferior personages
either of his Staff or from those of his Command
nor his Division Commanders, who were seeking
advancement by flattery, his Dept Council, already
offensive in its exhalts. or by cinnedars or
lies intended to depreciate, down one or two's
of his Division Commanders, who seldom went
a Capt. N^o 2 or 3 when written remonstrance or
information was obtainable.

He was placed prominently forward, in the first
instance, because he was connected by marriage
with the f.f. b? his wife being, a Miss Garland

of Virginia, and then by Dept armistice
Council. And persistent pushing himself
as Head Quartermaster, regardless of the Claims
or Merits of any others, in fact less deserving
than of all others, regardless of even the
truth if it was in his way. It gained him
final position. He is a brave man, and other
with his obstinacy, and Dept armistice
placed him far beyond his Merits. Such
at least as history, will award him.
He was incapable of conducting a Campaign
from the evolutions of his own brain
and his jealousy, of advice was so great
that really at times it seemed as if
he preferred that of the enemy, rather
than to take it from one of his Subordinates
and had taken it from the opposing
Commander. A notable instance
of this characteristic is the conduct of the
Campaign against Kee spville, which he Com-
manded. For he could not have ordered a

Movements, more to the advantage of
the opposing forces, if he had acted
only in conformity of the wishes of Burnside
and Gen Grant. The expedition was
such a remarkable failure, where
it should have been a success. But
those who knew of events as they happened
have attributed the failure, communally,
to a desire of Langston, not to succeed!
But I think they are attributable
rather to his hasty balance & nature
which unfitted him for Supreme
Command.

I hope leave to express my sympathy
for yourself & family in affliction

Very truly yours
L M "Law"

Gen' Langston's mother was a Scot of
the same blood as the wife of Gen' Grant.
hence the cause of the suspicion with which
Down persons, have regarded the "Curious" conduct
of Gen L. when he happened to be opposed to Gen' Grant.
- changing & turn etc.